Remarks

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-24, 26-31, and 33-38 are pending. Claims 3-8, 12-16, 26-28, 30, and 33-38 are original. Claims 1, 9, 11, 17, 19-24, 29, and 31 are presently amended. Claims 2, 10, 18, 25, and 32 are canceled.

Statement of Substance of Interview

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's attorney, Christopher Lattin, on September 27, 2006.

During the interview, each of the independent claims was discussed, including several possible claim amendments. The examiner indicated that after conducting an updated search, one outstanding feature is an "image file." The examiner also indicated that including language in the independent claims relating to "loading the driver image file into a memory" would make the claims more clear and tangible in view of 35 USC § 101. Applicant's attorney therefore understands the Examiner to agree that amending the claims as set forth above overcomes the rejections based on the cited documents and places the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the rejections, and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, the above claim amendments are amended to place them in condition for allowance.

Art Rejections

Claims 1-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Orleth et al. (Publication No. 2004/0215754 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Nevertheless,

without conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 1, 9, 17, 24, and 31 have been amended to even more clearly recite features of Applicant's invention. Support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure at paragraph [0023].

With regard to independent **Claim 1**, the prior art has not been shown to teach a computer implemented method that includes installing a driver package onto a computer using a side by side installer by receiving a driver package, generating a strong name for the driver package, and assigning a storage location for driver files associated with the driver package based on the strong name wherein the driver files include a driver image file.

With regard to independent **Claim 9**, the prior art has not been shown to teach a computer implemented method that includes generating a unique identity for respective driver packages to which commonly named driver files correspond; and assigning driver files associated with the individual driver packages to subdirectories in a common storage based on the unique identity wherein the driver files include a driver image file.

With regard to independent **Claim 17**, the prior art has not been shown to teach a computer-readable storage medium having one or more instructions to be executed by one or more processors, the one or more instructions causing the one or more processors to generate a strong name for a driver package and to assign a storage location for a driver file associated with the driver package based on the strong name wherein the driver file is a driver image file.

With regard to independent **Claim 24**, the prior art has not been shown to teach an apparatus, having an installer to generate a strong name for a driver package and a storage to install files associated with the driver package based on the strong name wherein the files associated with the driver package include a driver.

With regard to independent **Claim 31**, the prior art has not been shown to teach an apparatus, having a means for generating a strong name for a driver package and a means for

storing files associated with the driver package based on the strong name <u>wherein the files</u> <u>associated with the driver package include a driver image file</u>.

Dependent claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-23, 26-30, and 33-38 depend from one of Claims 1, 9, 17, 24, and 31 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

Conclusion

It is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: __10/30/06__   By: _____

Christopher W Lattin
Reg. No. 56064
(509) 324-9256